

REMARKS

Preliminary matters

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the personal Interview of July 27, 2010.

Amendment summary

Claim 33 is amended to clarify the recitation of R¹³.

Claim 34 is amended to clarify the recitation of OR⁴³.

Claim 56 is amended to correct a typographical error in the third-to-last line of the claim and, for grammatical purposes, to move the phrase “which comprises said biologically active moiety” to the recitation of formula V. Claim 56 is also amended to remove a typographical error and change “amino” to “anionic,” in the description of M². This amendment is supported at least, e.g., page 17, lines 3-4 and page 10, line 24 of the present specification.

No new matter is added by this Amendment, and Applicants respectfully submit that entry of this Amendment is proper.

Response to rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 33-37, 41-55, 64 and 67-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

With respect to Claim 33, Applicants respectfully submit that the structure of the product is not required to meet the written description requirement. A person having ordinary skill in the art reviewing the claim and the present specification would readily understand that Applicants had possession of the presently claimed invention. In particular, Claim 33 recites a polymerisation process for forming polymer conjugates of biologically active compounds. The

claim recites the structure (“polymer conjugates of biologically active compounds”) requested by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Response to rejection based on 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 33-37, 41-55, 64, and 67-70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to the Examiner’s position regarding Claim 33, Applicants note that the recitation of R¹³ has been amended, thus rendering this rejection moot.

With respect to the Examiner’s position regarding Claims 34 and 37, Applicants note that the recitation of R⁴³ has been amended, thus rendering the rejection moot.

With respect to the Examiner’s position regarding Claim 68 (see Paragraph No. 17 of the Office Action), Applicants respectfully submit that the claim was previously amended, addressing the Examiner’s concerns.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that the present claims are clear, and respectfully request the reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Travis B. Ribar /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

Travis B. Ribar
Registration No. 61,446

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 2, 2010